



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/714,283

11/14/2003

Eric Garland

7330.P001

2048

8791

7590

06/16/2010

BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP
1279 OAKMEAD PARKWAY
SUNNYVALE, CA 94085-4040

EXAMINER

ROBINSON, GRETA LEE

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2169

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

06/16/2010

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/714,283	Applicant(s) GARLAND ET AL.	
	Examiner Greta L. Robinson	Art Unit 2169	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 March 2010.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 9-16 and 24-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 9-16 and 24-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>03/22/10</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 9-16 and 24-30 are pending in the present application.
2. Claims 9, 15, 24-26 and 29-30 have been amended. Claims 1-8, 17-23 and 31-43 have been cancelled.

Information Disclosure Statement

3. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on March 22, 2010 is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement has been considered by the examiner, note attached copy of form PTO-1449.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claim 24-26, 9-12 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Dutta et al. US Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0138471 A1.

Art Unit: 2169

As per independent claim 24 Dutta teaches a method of tracking file storage on a peer-to-peer file-sharing network comprising:

coupling a computer to a database, the database to store lists of shared files available from peer computers on the peer-to-peer file-sharing network [see: fig.4, paragraph 70 and 0066];

coupling the computer to the peer-to-peer file-sharing network [see: fig.4, paragraph 70 (client rating database)];

locating a plurality of computers connected to the peer-to-peer file-sharing network by IP address [see: paragraph 71, lines 4-5];

requesting a listing of an entire library of shared files from each of said plurality of computers connected to the peer-to-peer file-sharing network [see: paragraph 59, lines 1-4];

receiving the listing of the entire libraries of shared files from each of said plurality of computers [see: paragraph 60, lines 1-4, paragraph 0041 and paragraph 0070]; and

automatically storing the received listing in the database, thereby tracking file storage on the peer-to-peer file-sharing network [see: paragraph 60, lines 1-4, paragraph 0041 and paragraph 0070].

As per claim 25, Dutta teaches:

further comprising adding source information to each of the received listing [see: paragraph 71].

As per claim 26, Dutta teaches:

wherein the source information comprises the geographic location of a computer

where the library of shared files is stored [note: paragraph 71].

As per independent claim 9 Dutta teaches:

a computer coupled to the peer-to-peer file-sharing network [see: fig.4, paragraph 70];

a database to store information about files available on the peer-to-peer file-sharing network

coupled to the computer at fig.4, paragraph 0066 ratings module monitors events [see: paragraph 70 (client rating database)];

a query device adapted to request a list of all shared files from a plurality of computers connected to the peer-to-peer file sharing network [see: paragraph 59, lines 1-4];

and a transfer device adapted to receive the list of all shared files

from each computer of the plurality of computers and automatically copy and store the list of shared files in the database, thereby tracking file storage on the peer-to-peer file-sharing network [see paragraph 60, lines 1-4, also note *shared file list* 264 paragraph 0041, paragraph 0066, 0059 obtains copy and stores in database; paragraph 0064 software component may be extendable API and paragraph 0065 plug-in routines may be implemented to coordinate routines and retrieve dynamically].

With respect to claim 10, same as claim arguments above and Dutta teaches:

further comprising an inventory preparation server coupled to the database at paragraph 71(client ratings database) and parg. 77, lines 11-13, rating server.

As per claim 11, same as claim arguments above and Dutta teaches:

Art Unit: 2169

further comprising an archiving system coupled to the database, the archiving system to store at least one copy of the plurality of lists at paragraph 71(client ratings database).

As per claim 12, same as claim arguments above and Dutta teaches:

further comprising an inventory processing server coupled to the database at paragraph 71.

Regarding claim 15, further comprising a reception device adapted to make a copy of a plurality of search requests from the network [note: note paragraph 0059 states the processor 322 makes a copy of the files and stores them in the ratings database].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was

Art Unit: 2169

not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

7. Claims 13-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dutta et al (Pub. No.: US 2002/0138471) in view of O'Kane (Pub. No.: US 2003/0105831).

As per claim 13-14 same as claim arguments above and Dutta teaches: further comprising an inventory preparation server coupled to the database, an inventory processing server coupled to the inventory preparation server at fig.4. Dutta do not explicitly teach a report preparation server coupled to the inventory processing server however O'Kane teaches this limitation at paragraph 62, lines 1-6 and paragraph 63. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the cited references to allow intellectual property owners a means to track royalties at paragraph 19, lines 1-4.

8. Claims 29-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dutta et al (Pub. No.: US 2002/0138471) in view of O'Kane (Pub. No.: US 2003/0105831).

As per claim 29-30 same as claim arguments above, however Dutta do not explicitly teach generating at least one report including data from a plurality of listings and a plurality of search requests however O'Kane teaches this limitation at paragraph 62, lines 1-6 and paragraph 63. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to combine the cited references to allow intellectual property owners a means to track royalties at paragraph 19, lines 1-4.

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments filed March 23, 2010 have been considered but they are not persuasive.

In the response Applicant argued the prior art does not teach receiving a list of all shared files from each computer and automatically copy and store the list of all shared files. In response to applicants amendment the examiner respectfully maintains the prior art rejection. Note Dutta provides for the ability to receive an entire library of shared files [see: paragraphs 006-007 and 070 distributed file-sharing system supports peer-to-peer model for exchanging data. Each node has a list of addresses that can directly communicate with each other. Each peer node searches its own database to satisfy the query. Copies the query to each node in its list of peer nodes. Dutta teaches an alternative embodiment wherein a list of shared files (264) may be imported and exported see paragraph 0041 and Figure 2C sharable file list element 264. O'Kane teaches devices in a file sharing environment for tracking and regulating process see paragraph 0062-0063. Dutta provides for tracking of file storage. Note Dutta is directed to monitoring file activities and teaches monitoring may vary depending on the software architecture see paragraph 0064. The system can snoop on traffic and can monitor directories in which system downloads or deletion is to take place (i.e. monitoring storage ability) see paragraph 0066. Dutta teaches the processor 322 monitors actions

Art Unit: 2169

and can perform various functions to determine how and when files are retrieved see paragraph 0066. Also note paragraph 0059 states the processor 322 makes a copy of the files and stores them in the ratings database.

Conclusion

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Liang et al. US Patent 6,996,707 B1

11. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2169

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Greta L. Robinson whose telephone number is (571)272-4118. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:30AM-6:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tony Mahmoudi can be reached on (571)272-4078. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Greta L. Robinson/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2169

June 15, 2010